

1 Ryan E. Hatch (SBN 235577)
rhatch@linerlaw.com
2 Jason L. Haas (SBN 217290)
jhaas@linerlaw.com
3 LINER LLP
1100 Glendon Avenue, 14th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90024.3518
4 Telephone: (310) 500-3500
Facsimile: (310) 500-3501
5

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff SIGNAL IP, INC.

7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 SIGNAL IP, INC., a California
11 corporation,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 AMERICAN HONDA MOTOR CO.,
15 INC, a California corporation; HONDA
OF AMERICA MFG., INC., an Ohio
16 corporation,

17 Defendants.

Case No. 2:14-cv-02454-JAK (JEMx)

**UPDATED JOINT REPORT ON
SEQUENCE OF CASES FOR
TRIAL**

Hon. John A. Kronstadt

First Trial Date: April 19, 2016

Plaintiff Signal IP, Inc., (“Plaintiff” or “Signal”) and defendants American Honda Motor Co., Inc. and Honda of America Mfg., Inc. (collectively “Honda”), Nissan North America, Inc. (“Nissan”), Mazda Motor of America, Inc. (“MMA”), Kia Motors America, Inc. (“KMA”), BMW of North America, LLC (“BMWNA”), and Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC (“MBUSA”), (collectively, “Defendants”) hereby submit their Joint Report on Sequence of Cases For Trial. This report is submitted pursuant to the Court’s direction at the February 1, 2016 hearing in these actions.

Plaintiff's Statement

In light of all the circumstances, Plaintiff proposes the following trial schedule:

Trial 1:	April 19, 2016	MBUSA
Trial 2:	June 7, 2016	Honda
Trial 3:	July 12, 2016	BMWNA
Trial 4:	September 6, 2016	Nissan
Unscheduled Trials:		MMA & KMA

Plaintiff's proposed order rests, in part, on the considerations addressed in its oppositions to Defendants' motions to stay. Mercedes did not move for a stay. Honda and BMWNA each has only a single claim that is currently subject to an IPR proceeding. Nissan and MMA, by contrast, each has three or more claims pending before the USPTO, and, in the absence of a compelling reason to try those actions first, Plaintiff proposes deferring those trials until after the others have been resolved. If necessary, the Court can decide the order of the unscheduled cases at a later time.

Plaintiff's proposed schedule assumes that Defendants' motions for summary judgment will be denied in their entirety. However, if the Court indicates at the March 7 hearing that it is inclined to grant summary judgment with respect to certain defendants or patents, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court direct the

parties to submit an updated joint report on the sequence of trial by March 11, 2016. That report would allow the parties to incorporate the Court's guidance into their proposals and provide the Court with revised input on the sequence of trials before the Court sets a final schedule.

MBUSA's, Honda's, Nissan's, BMWNA's and Kia's Statement

MBUSA's, Honda's, Nissan's, BMWNA's, and Kia's respective positions on the sequence of trials remain the same as set forth in the parties' December 21, 2015 joint report and discussed during the motion hearing on February 1, 2016.

MMA's Statement

MMA expects to prevail in this case when the Court issues rulings on the pending summary judgment and *Daubert* motions. Nonetheless, MMA agrees to the sequence provided by Signal IP above.

MMA notes that Signal IP asserts three patents against MMA. MMA disclosed separate technical experts for each asserted patent and separate fact witnesses for each asserted patent. The fact witnesses that MMA may call include, among others, a number of foreign, third-party witnesses who will require advance notice to make travel arrangements. Thus, it will be difficult, if not impossible, for MMA to schedule all of its witnesses by the first April 19, 2016 trial date.

Dated: February 26, 2016

LINER LLP

By: /s/ Ryan E. Hatch

Ryan E. Hatch

Attorneys for Plaintiff SIGNAL IP, INC.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Dated: February 26, 2016

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

By: /s/ Ahmed J. Davis
Ralph A. Phillips (Pro Hac Vice)
Ahmed J. Davis (Pro Hac Vice)
Attorneys for Defendants
AMERICAN HONDA MOTOR CO., INC;
and HONDA OF AMERICA MFG., INC.

Dated: February 26, 2016

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.

By: /s/ Patrick A. Lujin
Patrick A. Lujin
B. Trent Webb
Richard D. Eiszner
Gabriel S. Spooner
Douglas W. Robinson
Jamie H. Kitano
Attorneys for Defendant
NISSAN NORTH AMERICA, INC.

Dated: February 26, 2016

DLA PIPER, LLP

By: /s/ Patrick S. Park
Patrick S. Park
Attorney for Defendant
MAZDA MOTOR OF AMERICA, INC.

1 Dated: February 26, 2016

GREENBERG TRAURIG LLP

2

3

4

5

6

By: /s/ Stephen Shahida
Stephen Shahida
Attorneys for Defendant
KIA MOTORS AMERICA, INC.

7 Dated: February 26, 2016

DLA PIPER LLP

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

By: /s/ Brian Biggs
Joseph P. Lavelle
Andrew N. Stein
Brian Biggs
Patrick Park
Attorneys for Defendant
BMW OF NORTH AMERICA, LLC

15 Dated: February 26, 2016

ZUBER, LAWLER, & DEL DUCA LLP

16

17

18

19

By: /s/ Don A. Hernandez
Don A. Hernandez

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

FRIED, FRANK, HARRIS, SHRIVER &
JACOBSON LLP
Scott W. Doyle (pro hac vice)
Jonathan DeFosse (pro hac vice)
Attorneys for Defendant
MERCEDES-BENZ USA, LLC

SIGNATURE ATTESTATION

I hereby certify that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from each of the other signatories shown above.

By: /s/ Ryan E. Hatch

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28